

# **EXHIBIT N**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE: . Case No.: 03-10945 (MFW)  
FLEMING COMPANIES, INC. et al. . 821 North Market Street  
Debtor, . Wilmington, Delaware 19801  
Date: July 26, 2004  
Time: 9:46 a.m.

CERTIFIED:  
AS A TRUE COPY:  
ATTEST:

DAVID D. BIRD, CLERK  
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT

Deputy Clerk 1/11/06

TRANSCRIPT OF OMNIBUS HEARING  
BEFORE HONORABLE MARY F. WALRATH  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, Young,  
Jones & Weintraub, P.C.  
By: LAURA DAVIS JONES, ESQ.  
CHRIS J. LHULIER, ESQ.  
919 North Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899-8705

For the Debtor: Kirkland & Ellis, LLP  
By: RICHARD L. WYNNE, ESQ.  
ERIC LIEBELER, ESQ.  
200 East Randolph Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601

Audio Operator: Danielle R. Cherry

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript  
Produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.  
268 Evergreen Avenue  
Hamilton, New Jersey 08619  
E-Mail: [jjcourt@optonline.net](mailto:jjcourt@optonline.net)

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

# 9150

APPEARANCES: (cont'd)

For AWG

Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C.  
By: SELINDA A. MELNIK, ESQ.  
Chase Manhattan Centre  
1201 N. Market Street  
Wilmington. DE 19801

For Farris Class Action  
Plaintiffs

Werb & Sullivan  
By: DUANE D. WERB, ESQ.  
300 Delaware Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Kemps, LLC, et al.

Morris James Hitchens & Williams  
By: STEPHEN MILLER, ESQ.  
222 Delaware Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Raymond Choy

Potter, Anderson & Corroon  
By: MADISON L. CASHMAN, ESQ.  
1313 N. Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For SuperValu

Sidley Austin Brown & Wood  
By: WILLIAM EVANOFF, ESQ.

For Office of U.S. Trustee

United States Dept. of Justice  
By: JOSEPH McMAHON, ESQ.  
J. Caleb Boggs Federal Bldg.  
844 N. King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

For Russell Stover

Connolly, Bove, Lodge & Hutz, LLP  
By: JEFFREY WISLER, ESQ.  
1220 Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Pre- & Post-Petition  
Agents

Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
By: DENNIS A. MELORO, ESQ.  
The Brandywine Bldg.  
1000 West Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

For ACE

White & Williams, LLP  
By: MARC S. CASARINO, ESQ.  
LEONARD GOLDBERGER, ESQ.  
824 N. Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For OUCC

Pepper Hamilton, LLP  
By: WILLIAM COHEN, ESQ.  
1201 Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For C&S Acquisition

Landis Rath & Cobb  
By: RICHARD S. COBB, ESQ.  
MEGAN N. HARPER, ESQ.  
919 Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

For Sonitrol Management

Reed Smith, LLP  
By: KIMBERLY E. C. LAWSON, ESQ.  
1201 Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

For Teamsters Union & UFCW

Previant, Goldberg Uelmen Gratz  
Miller & Brueggeman  
By: FREDERICK PERILLO, ESQ.  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Heiman Gouge & Kaufman  
By: SUSAN KAUFMAN, ESQ.  
800 King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Wayne Berry

William W. Erhart, PA  
By: WILLIAM W. ERHART, ESQ.  
800 King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Buy For Less, Northstar

Walsh, Monzack & Monaco, P.A.  
By: RACHEL B. MERSKY, ESQ.  
1201 North Orange Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899

For Big 8

Campbell & Levine  
By: MARK HURFORD, ESQ.  
800 N. King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

By Phone:

For Debtors

Kirkland & Ellis  
By: JAMIE SPRAYREGEN, ESQ.  
SHIRLEY CHO, ESQ.  
200 East Randolph Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601

For Bradley Operating, LP

McGuire Woods, LLP  
By: MICHAEL SCHMAHL, ESQ.  
150 North Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60601

For Wayne Berry

Lynch Ichida Thompson Kim &  
Hirota  
By: TIMOTHY HOGAN, ESQ.  
1132 Bishop Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

For BP Products  
North America

Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP  
By: DEBRA SUDOCK, ESQ.  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178

For General Mills and  
Marigold

Frederickson & Byron  
By: FAY KNOWLES, ESQ.

For Application to retain  
Bob Reynolds

By: BOB REYNOLDS, ESQ.

For Lexington Insurance

Grotefeld & Denenberg  
By: LYNN WEAVER, ESQ.  
105 West Adams Street  
Chicago, IL 60603

Closing Argument/Hogan

172

1 THE COURT: But tell me the basis in paragraph 18 for  
2 his belief that API would have been limited to 20 containers per  
3 week without his software.

4 MR. HOGAN: Yeah, it's in the other part of his  
5 declaration, Your Honor, in the story of API. And I don't want  
6 to go into it because it's not in the record. But it's -- Mr.  
7 Berry, I think it was testified, was the president of API, came  
8 in and helped run the company. And his -- it isn't -- it's  
9 knowledge of the person who would know these facts. That -- the  
10 intrinsic value of selling a unique piece of software to someone  
11 is going to be difficult for anyone to establish, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Yeah, but isn't the best evidence what you  
13 were actually getting from Fleming? Which was zero.

14 MR. HOGAN: Well, no, I don't think that -- Your Honor,  
15 I understand that Mr. Berry allowed Fleming to use his software  
16 and I believe Mr. Stuecy's statements in that memorandum as an  
17 interim measure. And as we had Mr. Dillon discussing, one of the  
18 reasons Mr. Berry did that is so he could employ his former  
19 employees as the company was being put out of business.

20 Now, it may not seem like a good business deal for most  
21 people, but I don't think it should be construed as him waiving  
22 his rights as a copyright owner. To protect --

23 THE COURT: I'm not suggesting his waiving his rights,  
24 but he's suggesting he's put a value on those rights. And  
25 there's nothing in the exhibits to suggest it was a temporary

1 measure only.

2 MR. HOGAN: Only the exhibit that I referred to, Your  
3 Honor, the EULA, the first page of the EULA that was the  
4 memorandum.

5 THE COURT: Yeah, but even your statement, the long  
6 term goal of our operation is to interface with our company's  
7 total inbound logistics system. What does that mean?

8 MR. HOGAN: It's, I believe, to get rid of Mr. Berry.  
9 That's what I believe it meant. Which is -- he's almost gone,  
10 Your Honor, so --

11 (Laughter)

12 MR. HOGAN: But now he's C&S's problem.

13 (Laughter)

14 THE COURT: Yes, he will.

15 MR. HOGAN: Let's say I have nothing else, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: All right. What other evidence?

17 MR. HOGAN: I think that's it, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right.

19 MR. LIEBELER: Nothing further on estimation, Your  
20 Honor. I would yield to Mr. Sprayregen with respect to the  
21 overall confirmation issues.

22 THE COURT: All right. Well, let me make a ruling on  
23 the estimation so we can proceed more orderly. I think that --  
24 and again, for purposes of this proceeding, I must assume there  
25 is some claim that Mr. Berry has against the debtor that would

1 qualify as an administrative expense. And I'm prepared to  
2 estimate the administrative expense at \$100,000.

3       The only evidence really before me that it has any  
4 value, the license agreement provides that the debtor may use it  
5 for no licensing fee. So that is not evidence of any value for  
6 the debtor's use that would constitute the administrative  
7 expense. There is the jury verdict that found that the debtor  
8 had made improper changes to and was using the changed version  
9 which constituted infringement and the jury awarded damages of  
10 approximately \$98,000. So that is some evidence of a value that  
11 can be attributed to any claim for infringement. That is, change  
12 of the original version of the software.

13       With respect to any alleged damages for a sale to C&S,  
14 there is no evidence of a sale to C&S. The asset purchase  
15 agreement specifically does not include the software. My ruling  
16 at the hearing on approval of the asset purchase agreement made  
17 it clear that there was no sale of Mr. Berry's software. So  
18 nothing can be attributed to any value the debtor received as a  
19 result of any sale of the software. So I would estimate the  
20 Berry administrative claim against the debtor at \$100,000.

21       MR. SPRAYREGEN: Thank you, Your Honor. With respect  
22 to confirmation, and obviously in my confirmation argument, I'll  
23 take this ruling in account with respect to the feasibility  
24 objection, I think in the first instance there was one party that  
25 I had reported was resolved, Mr. Block. And they stepped up and



Closing Argument/Sprayregen

175

1 it was a little bit unclear whether there was still a  
2 confirmation objection or whether he was just agreeing that it  
3 was close to being resolved but it wasn't resolved yet. I can  
4 report and I believe Mr. Block's counsel is still in the  
5 courtroom, that that is now settled and the documentation is in  
6 process and the settlement of that claim we would intend to  
7 submit under a certification of counsel to the extent the court  
8 order will confirm the plan.

9 MR. HOUSTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Joseph  
10 Houston of Stevens Lee and Dunn. That is correct. We have  
11 reached an agreement. It's simply a matter now of actually  
12 signing an agreement and on that basis we withdraw the objection.

13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

14 MR. HOUSTON: Thank you.

15 MR. SPRAYREGEN'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

16 MR. SPRAYREGEN: So, Your Honor, we're back to where I  
17 thought we started which is with the one objection. And the  
18 basis of the objection is both feasibility and lack of good faith  
19 that we proposed a plan by means of forbidden by law. I would in  
20 the first instance state that we believe all of the other  
21 evidence we've put in satisfies all of the other confirmation  
22 standards and I'm happy to go through those because it is our  
23 burden, but I think they're well in the evidence unless the Court  
24 desires them.

25 THE COURT: That's fine. I think it's stated in the

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript,  
from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the  
above-entitled matter.

Susan Holcomb August 3, 2004  
Susan Holcomb, Transcriber

AAERT Cert. No. D-273